DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 488 SO 012 427

AUTHOR McAuley, William J.: Nutty, Cheri L.
TITLE Residential Preferences and Moving Behavior: A Family Life Cycle Analysis.
INSTITUTION Virginia Commonwealth Univ., Richmond.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Child Health and Human Development (NIH), Bethesda, Md.
PUB DATE 28 Aug 79
CONTRACT NIH-NICHD-72-2743
NOTE 28p.: Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (Boston, MA, Aug. 27-31, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Changing Attitudes: Decision Making: Environmental Influences: *Family Life: *Family Mobility: *Life Style: Literature Reviews: Migration: Mobility: Occupational Mobility: *Relocation: Social Science Research: State Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Life Cycles

ABSTRACT

The relationship of family life cycle changes to housing preferences and residential mobility is examined. Two residential decision-making issues are explored in detail--how family life cycle stages influence what people view as important to their choice of residential setting and what individuals at different family life cycle stages view as the probability of moving providing they could obtain a satisfactory residential environment. Data were gathered from a random survey of 780 Pennsylvania residents plus a screened sample of 316 respondents who indicated a high probability that the household would move within the coming year. Respondents were asked to indicate which characteristics were desirable in a new residence, whether these characteristics were very important to their choice of residence, and whether they were likely to move if they located a residence with all or most of the desirable qualities. Findings indicate that work status is an important factor in decision making, younger people are more likely to move, and the age and presence of children plays a large role in family decisions to relocate. The conclusion is that many of the conditions and circumstances experienced by people in different life cycle stages are reflected in the kinds of concerns they express toward residential characteristics. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183488

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William J. McAuley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

RESIDENTIAL PREFERENCES AND MOVING BEHAVIOR:

A FAMILY LIFE CYCLE ANALYSIS

William J. McAuley and Cheri L. Nutty

Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, Virginia 23284

SO 012 427

The data upon which this publication is based were collected pursuant to Contract No. NIH-NICHD-72-2743 with the National Institutes of Child Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and Pennsylvania's Title V Rural Development Act funds.

"Not for reproduction, quotation, or any other use without permission of the author, except for press use after August 28, 1979."

This study is designed to explore two related topics aimed at determining the association between family life cycle stage and residential decision-making. First of all, we want to examine in detail how family life cycle stage influences what people view as important to their choice of a residential setting. Secondly, we wish to determine what individuals at different family life cycle stages view as the probability of moving providing they could obtain those characteristics of the residential environment which they consider most important. This investigation is an outgrowth of an extensive tradition of research linking family life cycle, housing preferences and residential mobility. Much of the credit for this research tradition belongs to Peter Rossi (1955) whose investigation of household residential mobility in Philadelphia showed how important family life cycle events and family composition are to residential mobility decision-making. According to Rossi, the housing requirements of a family are strongly tied to its family life cycle stage, and much residential mobility, especially short-distance moves can be explained in terms of individual efforts to satisfy housing needs brought about by life cycle changes.

More recently, Earl Morris and his associates have developed a conceptual framework which explains family residential mobility as a reaction to normative housing deficits. Such deficits arise when the family "perceives a salient gap between its housing and that required by the (prevailing housing) norms" (Morris and Winter, 1975:85). Thus, while the family may view itself as having a housing "need", such "needs" are likely to be the result of cultural standards rather than minimal requirements for health

and safety. A change of residence is one method by which normative housing deficits can be removed or reduced (others include alteration of the present residence and family adaptation). Family life cycle stage is viewed as an important element in this theory of housing adjustment because "families in some stages are much more likely to experience certain deficits than families in other stages" (Morris, Crull and Winter, 1976:309). While Morris and his associates gave examples of how normative housing deficits may differ according to family life cycle stage, they did not specifically investigate this issue.

Both Rossi's "housing needs" approach to residential mobility and the "normative housing deficit" model of Morris and his associates suggest that family life cycle stage is an important determinant of preferences toward residential characteristics and that residential mobility is at least one method by which residential preferences can be attained. But how do residential preferences differ across the family life cycle? Past research, summarized below, offers some clues as to the kinds of residential characteristics which families at different life cycle stages might seek.

Rossi (1955) and others (Chevan, 1971; Leslie and Richardson, 1961, Pickvance, 1973) cite space deficits as among the most important of the residential concerns generated by life cycle changes. During the expansion and childrearing stages families are likely to express a desire for larger dwellings, while older families may perceive a housing surplus (Morris, Crull and Winter, 1976; Pickvance, 1973). According to Abu-Lughod and Foley (1960), the "undercrowded" conditions of those in the later stages are not

likely to be a major concern, while the overcrowded circumstances of families with children can be quite important to them.

The childrearing phase is a period when families may be more concerned about local facilities such as parks and clinics (Pickvance, 1973). Furthermore, since residential location for the most part determines what kinds of companions the children will have and the kinds of schools they will attend, neighborhood and school quality may also become more salient residential features during the childrearing phase (Abu-Lughod and Foley, 1960; Chevan, 1971; Ross, 1955).

There is some indirect evidence that concern about distance to the central city and convenience to services and stores differs by stage in the family life cycle. Young unmarrieds and widows may find it more convenient to live closer to downtown areas, while those who are married and have young children may desire to live in more suburban surroundings (Abu-Lughod and Foley, 1960; Lansing and Barth, 1964).

Neither Morris nor Rossi consider occupational characteristics in their models due to their concern with short distance moves and with housing rather than general residential needs and deficits. However, we view it as appropriate to consider occupational factors among important residential qualities since many moves are made for occupational reasons (Lansing and Mueller, 1967). Several studies suggest that occupational factors may be most salient in the earlier stages of the family life cycle (Lansing and Mueller, 1967; Beshers and Nishuira, 1961; Geist, 1968).

Climate can also be an important residential amenity (Ullman, 1954), and the relatively high rate of migration of many old persons to the Sun

Belt states serves as indirect evidence that it is an important factor in residential choice during the later life cycle stages. Two investigations of older migrants to Florida found climate to be one of the most important reasons given for moving (Burgess, Hoyt and Manley, 1955; Honnen, Eteng and Marshall (1969).

While the literature cited above does provide evidence that life cycle and residential preferences are associated, it provides an incomplete picture at best. Many studies have examined only one or two family life cycle stages or have focused on age rather than family life cycle. Others have been concerned with preferences for a few types of residential characteristics rather than the broad range of potentially important attributes. Still others have attempted to make inferences about residential preference from migration or mobility patterns. Some have focused upon the reasons recent migrants gave for moving -- thus measuring goals of movers rather than general residential preference patterns in the population. Our investigation is meant to provide a more comprehensive and less ambiguous view of residential preferences and family life cycle. We will examine the importance individuals at different family life cycle stages attach to a wide variety of residential characteristics. We will also investigate the likelihood that availability of the most important characteristics would lead to residential mobility.

METHODS

Data

Data for this investigation were obtained by means of a statewide sample survey of Pennsylvania residents. The survey was based upon a multi-stage area probability sample down to the block level where quota sampling was used, with quotas based upon sex and employment status. The sampling procedures were designed to identify a representative sample of the non-institutionalized population eighteen years of age and over. Respondents were either heads of household or their spouses. Selection criteria resulted in a random sample of 780 respondents plus a screened sample of 316 respondents who indicated a high probability that the household would move within the coming year. These samples were combined and a weighting procedure was used to create a data set which was representative of the Pennsylvania population.[1]

Family Life Cycle Stages

A major problem with any investigation based upon family life cycle is the operationalization of life cycle stages. Although the family life cycle is based on the recognition of successive patterns and phases as they occur within the continuity of family living over time, each family life cycle is unique, and stages designed to categorize the more common phases are unlikely to find general acceptance (Duvall, 1977). Furthermore, limitations of data often, as in the present study, require the use of cross-sectional data even though longitudinal data would be more appropriate.

[1]For more information on the questions, data collection procedures and weighting formula, the reader is referred to DeJong (1978).

Stages of the family life cycle can be few or many based on several factors. Duvall (1977:142-145), for example, cites several family life cycle models which range from two to twenty-four stages. For the purposes of this study, family life cycle stages and defined as follows: Stage I - young (respondent less than 45 years old), never married; Stage II - young, married with no children; Stage III - young, married with young children (at least one child 0-5, but none older than 5); Stage IV - married, at least one child age 6-17 at home); Stage V - old (respondent at least 45 years old), married no children at home; Stage VI - old, widowed. These stages are similar to the "typical" family life cycle stages described by Abu-Lughod and Foley (1960), and they represent only slight modifications of Speare's (1970) definitions of family life cycle stages. Speare treats the first year of marriage as a separate family life cycle stage because residential mobility is the norm during that year. Unfortunately, there were too few cases in this phase to allow for separate analysis. Therefore, those falling into the "just married" category are included with other young marrieds who have no children. Also, Speare included all unmarrieds in his first and last stages while ours contain only singles and widows, respectively. We opted for "purer" categories at these levels despite the reduction in number of cases.

(Table 1)

Table 1 contains demographic information on the family life cycle stages used in the study. The range of cases across stages is quite large, with young singles being the least numerous and couples with at least one

child six to seventeen years old being most numerous. A total of 956 cases were classified by the scheme, representing 87.2 percent of the original, weighted sample. Most of those excluded from the classification were divorced or separated, but there were some additional respondents who failed to meet one or more of the criteria for specific stages (e.g. old couples with only young children, older single persons, young widows). Respondents are predominately female in all stages except older couples without children. Perhaps higher levels of retirement at this stage make males more accessible to the interviewer. Also, the older widowed category contains very few males, reflecting conditions in the general population. Most respondents in all life cycle categories are white. Persons in the later stages have less education on the average, again a reflection of conditions in the population. The data on age of respondent suggests that there are only minor age differences across the first three stages, but couples with older children are thirteen years older than young couples with young children and about twenty-two years younger than older couples without children. As might be expected, the older widowed category has the oldest average age.

Residential Preferences

Residential preferences were measured by asking the respondents to suppose they had decided to move from this place and had to give some thought to the qualities they would most prefer in new residence. They were then asked to indicate whether each of several characteristics would be very important, important or not important to their choice. Responses

were scored so that a high score represented a higher level of importance. There were forty-seven residential characteristics in all, and they covered attributes of the home, the neighborhood, the job, the area and convenience items. For a complete listing of preference items, the reader is referred to DeJong (1978).

Respondents were also asked which residential characteristics they considered most important of all as well as those which were second and third in importance. Answers to these questions are particularly relevant to the present investigation since they suggest what aspects of residence people of different life cycle stages consider most salient. Follow-ups to these questions are also useful in determining how much of an impact the most important residential characteristics would have on residential mobility.

Likelihood of Moving

Once respondents had decided which characteristics were first, second and third in importance, they were asked to indicate their likelihood of moving if all else remained the same but they could obtain the characteristic they considered most important. This was followed by a question about their likelihood of mobility if they could have the two residential attributes they considered to be first and second in importance and by a final question on the likelihood of moving if they could obtain the top three residential attributes. Responses to the questions were scored from 1(not at all likely) to 5 (definitely would move).

As Morris, Crull and Winter (1976) note, questions concerning likelihood or expectations of moving are not direct measures of actual mobility even

though such measures of propensity are highly related to subsequent residential moves. But propensity is in itself a useful measure since it provides a determination of who would move under a given set of circumstances. The measure of likelihood serves us well here since we are attempting to measure the impact of availability of residential characteristics and have no direct control over availability. The measure of likelihood of moving under the hypothetical ceteris paribus conditions outlined above should give us useful benchmark measures of the relative behavioral impact of residential preferences items.

RESULTS

Residential Preferences

(Table 2)

There were forty-seven preference items in the original survey. We employed factor analysis as a method of reducing this larger variable set to a more manageable set of dimensions. The method of principal components factoring with iterations was used on all cases in the file. This procedure led to an initial extraction of thirteen factors with eigenvalues greater than one. Factors eleven, twelve, and thirteen in combination explained less than seven percent of the variance in the full set of items. Additionally, they were viewed as being somewhat redundant substantively, and the item loadings on these three factors were all rather low. Therefore, these three factors, along with seven individual items possessing communalities of less than .25 were excluded in a subsequent principal components factoring. The resulting ten factors (together explaining 56.6 percent of the variance in the reduced set of forty individual items) were submitted to orthogonal rotation. Table 2 presents the final set of factors along with the individual items whose loadings were .40 or greater.

Labeling the results of a factor analysis is always a somewhat arbitrary process. But the factors extracted through the procedures described above are conceptually defensible, and the labels were not difficult to derive. Perhaps the least suitable label is assigned to the fifth factor (child-related). The combination of items closely parallels the residential characteristics (space, recreation, schools) which Abu-Lughod and Foley (1960) describe as most salient for families with children. This dimension differs

substantively from the second factor (cultural-recreational) in that the cultural-recreational factor emphasizes only general community availability of facilities (not convenience) and also loads heavily on social cultural contacts rather than schools and internal and external space.

(Table 3)

Using the SPSS (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner and Bent, 1975) FACSCORE procedure, factor scores were calculated for each of the ten factors. The mean scores at each family life cycle stage are presented in Table 3 along with results of a one-way analysis of variance. Examining values within columns of Table 3 affords a view of how individuals in different family life cycle stages rate each dimension. There are obvious patterns of association between the stages and scores on the dimensions. For example, certain of the dimensions are clearly viewed more positively by individuals at one particular stage, while others generate concern over sets of related stages.

Two dimensions appear to primarily differentiate age groups. The cultural/recreational dimension is of greatest importance to young singles, but high scores continue through Stage III. Shopping convenience/availability, on the other hand is primarily a concern of the last two stages in the model. It is especially important to the widowed, a group which may experience reduced functional capacity. Couples with children most heavily favor two of the dimensions. As might be expected, they are much more likely to have higher scores on both the child-related and the institutional dimensions.

While scores on the factor covering character of neighborhood become positive during the child-bearing and child-rearing stages, these concerns continue through Stage IV.

Interest in informal contacts reaches its highest point in widowhood. It is possible that loss of a spouse leads to an increased emphasis on friends and relatives for social interaction and emotional support. The physical qualities of the residence (climate, mountains, water, etc.) are of greatest concern to older couples, especially those in Stage V. This is in agreement with prior researchers focusing on interest in physical ammenities in retirement moves (Burgess, Hoyt and Manley, 1955; Honnen, Eteng and Marshall, 1969; Ullman, 1954). But our findings suggest that people may begin to give greater consideration to physical characteristics of residential environments well in advance of retirement.

Scores on the employment dimension are highest in Stages II and III. These are points in the family life cycle when individuals are expected to "settle" into a career, and characteristics of a job may therefore become a major issue in residential decisions. Furthermore establishment of a separate household and increases in family size during these phases may lead to increased financial concerns which are expressed through the employment dimension.

Young couples without children place more emphasis on housing appearance than do those in other categories. Persons in this stage are just beginning to establish their own separate households. Often

the initial home is inadequate (Abu-Lughod and Foley, 1960). It is therefore likely that these respondents place greater importance on upgrading their housing. Space is not yet, however, a central issue.

(Table 4)

Data gathered in the survey provide another way of examining differences in residential preference. Each respondent was asked to decide which of all the individual residential characteristics was most important, second most important and third most important to have in a new place to live. Table 4 presents the residential attributes mentioned most often at each level of importance. These data show the very strong interest among all respondents in cost of housing. This is the characteristic mentioned as most important by the largest proportion of responderts at each stage. Cost of housing was deleted from the prior factor analysis because its communality was low, but we can infer from Table 4 that it is a most important separate dimension which cuts across stages of the family life cycle. Other items appear to be associated with family life cycle stage, however. For example, quality of school ranks high among those with children; job items are more important in the earlier stages; and property tax becomes an important item among older widows.

(Table 5)

Likelihood of Moving

The final concern of this paper is likelihood of moving if respondents could obtain those residential attributes they rate as most important.

Table 5 displays the mean likelihood of moving at each stage under the condition that the respondent would obtain: 1) the characteristic ranked most important, 2) the two most important characteristics, and 3) the three most important characteristics. Young singles and young couples with pre-school children are among the most likely to move in response to availability of preferred characteristics. Older people, both widowed and married, are not nearly as likely to move.

Peter Morrison (1969) has suggested that some segments of the popluation have high thresholds with respect to mobility and that such individuals are neither likely to seek out those residential amenities they desire nor act upon such amenities if they should encounter them. Apparently, younger persons (especially young singles) have relatively low residential mobility thresholds since they are more willing to respond to available opportunities by moving. Older persons appear to have much higher thresholds. It may be that older persons are less responsive to availability of desired features because their residential preferences match the characteristics of their present residences. The survey provides some evidence of this. An open-ended question asked respondents to suppose they had absolute freedom to choose the kind of area their households could live in and to describe what it would be like. Those in the older categories were far more likely to give "right here" as their response. It may also be that the higher mobility thresholds among the older respondents results from higher levels of community integration at these stages. Calvin Goldscheider (1971) has hypothesized that much of the reduced mobility in old age can be explained by means of their greater social and economic ties to a particular residential setting.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

While there is much disagreement concerning appropriate indicators of family life cycle stages and the number of stages, there is general agreement that as individuals move through the family life cycle they experience periods which bring about unique conditions and circumstances. The present study offers evidence that many of the conditions and circumstances experienced by people in different life cycle stages are reflected in the kinds of concerns they express toward residential characteristics. Some attributes of residence are of more concern to those in a particular family life cycle stage, while concerns for other attributes span several related stages.

Our results also suggest that family life cycle stage is associated with differential likelihood of acting upon availability of the most important characteristics through residential mobility. Younger persons, especially singles, are far more likely to move if they could obtain those aspects of residence they consider most important, while older individuals are less likely to move in response to availability of desired residential characteristics. These differences in thresholds may be due to variations in levels of community integration, or they may result from difference in congruence between respondents' present residences and what they view as ideal. Future research should directly investigate these issues.

The indicators of family life cycle stage used in this paper included age, presence and age of children and marital status. Our results suggest categories defined by means of these elements are important in the determination of some patterns of residential concern and likelihood of moving. Future research should examine whether life cycle stages incorporating such

aspects of family development as number of children and work status serve to differentiate concern about residence and likelihood of residential change. Studies based upon longitudinal rather than cross-sectional data are also called for. Until such investigations are carried out we cannot discount the possibility that some of the differences in residential preference and likelihood of moving are due to variations in short experiences.

References

Abu-Lughod, Janet and Mary, Mix Foley
1960 "Consumer differences." Pp. 95-133 in Nelson Foote, Janet Abu-Lughod, Mary Foley and Louis Winnick, Housing Choices and Housing Constraints. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Beshers, James M. and Eleanor N. Nishuira
1961 "A theory of internal migration differentials". Social Forces 39: 214-218.

Burgess, Ernest W., G. Calvin Hoyt, and Charles R. Manley
1955 "The construction of scales for the measurement of migration after retirement". Sociometry 18: 616-623.

Chevan, Albert
1971 "Family growth, household density, and moving". Demography. 8: 451-458.

DeJong, Gordon F.
1978 Residential Preferences and Migration Survey Code Book. University Park: Population Issues Research Office, The Pennsylvania State University.

Duvall, Evelyn Mills
1977 Marriage and Family Development. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

Geist, Harold
1968 The Psychological Aspects of the Aging Process: with Sociological Implications. St. Louis: Warren H. Green.

Goldscheider, Calvin
1971 Population, modernization and Social Structure. Boston: Little, Brown.

Honnmen, James G., William I. A. Eteng, and Douglas G. Marshall
1969 Retirement Migration in the North Central States: Comparative Socio-economic Analysis; Wisconsin and Florida. Madison: University of Wisconsin Department of Rural Sociology.

Lansing, John B. and Nancy Barth
1964a Residential Location and Urban Mobility. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

1964b Residential Location and Urban Mobility: A Multivariate Analysis. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Lansing, John B. and Eva Mueller
1967 The Geographic Mobility of Labor. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Leslie, Gerald R. and Arthur H. Richardson
1961 "Life cycle, career pattern and the decision to move". American Sociological Review 26: 894-902.

Morris, Earl W., Sue R. Crull, and Mary Winter
1976 "Housing norms, housing satisfaction and the propensity to move". Journal of Marriage and the Family 38: 309-320.

Morris, Earl W. and Mary Winter
1975 "A theory of family housing adjustment". Journal of Marriage and the Family 37: 79:88.

Morrison, Peter
1969 Theoretical Issues in the Design of Population Mobility Models. Santa Monica: Rand.

Nie, Norman H., C. Hadlai Hull, Jean Jenkins, Karen Steinbrenner and Dale Bent
1975 SPSS Satistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pickvance, C. G.
1973 "Life-cycle, housing tenure, and intra-urban residential mobility: a causal model". Sociological Review 21: 279-297

Rossi, P. H.
1955 Why Families Move. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.

Speare, Jr., Alden
1970 "Home ownership, life cycle stage, and residential mobility". Demography 7: 449-457.

Ullman, Edward C.
1954 "Amenities as a factor in regional growth". Geographical Review 44: 119-132.

Table 1

Definitions of Family Life Cycle Stages
and Demographic Profile of Sample

	Definition of Stage	Number of Cases	Percent Male Respondents	Percent White Respondents	Mean Years Education	Mean Age
I	Young (<45), single	35	31.4	74.3	12.6	27.0
II	Young, married, no children	68	38.2	80.9	11.6	29.7
III	Young, married, young (0-5) children only	97	34.0	96.9	12.8	27.2
IV	Married (any age) at least one child age 6-17	337	40.9	93.1	11.8	40.2
V	Old (≥45), married, no children in home	290	53.1	90.7	10.3	62.3
VI	Old, widowed	130	16.9	88.5	9.5	66.7
	Totals	956	40.2	90.8	11.2	48.1

Table 2

Factor Analysis of Residential Preference Items:
Factor Labels and Items with Loadings of .40 or Higher

1. EMPLOYMENT

.56 Opportunity for Advancement
.72 Job Security
.63 Fringe Benefits
.57 Overall Work Situation

2. CULTURAL/RECREATIONAL

.43 Availability of Parks and Recreation Facilities
.41 Availability of Entertainment
.65 Opportunities for Cultural Activities
.72 Opportunities for Contact with Variety of People
.64 Opportunities for Clubs
.50 Opportunities for Recreation Facilities

3. SHOPPING CONVENIENCE/AVAILABILITY

.40 Transportation
.73 Availability of Shopping
.81 Convenience to Shopping

4. NEIGHBORHOOD CHARACTER

.41 Friendliness of Neighbors
.68 Reputation of Neighborhood
.62 Kind of People Around You
.52 General Appearance of Neighborhood

5. CHILD-RELATED

.40 Size of Rooms
.42 Spaciousness of Yard and Grounds
.52 Number of Rooms
.41 Availability of Parks and Recreation Facilities
.44 Quality of Local Schools
.40 Convenience to Recreation Facilities
.50 Convenience to Schools

6. HOUSING APPEARANCE

.72 Outside Appearance of House
.74 Inside Appearance of House

Table 2 (Continued)

7. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORTS

.40 Quality of Local Schools
.47 Convenience of Medical Facilities
.56 Convenience of Church
.63 Convenience of Schools

8. HEALTH AND SAFETY

.51 Quality of Local Services (Fire, Police, Etc.)
.49 Healthiness of Local Environment (Clean Air, Water, Etc.)
.45 Safeness of Streets

9. INFORMAL CONTACTS

.73 Convenience to Homes of Friends
.72 Convenience to Homes of Relatives

10. PHYSICAL QUALITIES

.48 Climate
.68 Physical Characteristics (Water, Mountains, Etc.)

TABLE 3

Mean Scores on Residential Preference Dimensions by Family Life Cycle Stage[a]

Family Life Cycle Stage	Employment	Cultural/ Recreational	Shopping Convenience Availability	Neighborhood Character	Child-Related	Housing Appearance	Institutional Supports	Health & Safety	Informal Contacts	Physical Qualities
I	- .17	.57	- .07	- .58	.12	.07	- .45	.14	- .35	- .10
II	.13	.20	- .12	- .15	- .02	.27	- .31	- .00	.07	- .12
III	.23	.22	- .09	.11	.42	- .08	.29	.13	.06	- .16
IV	- .01	.04	- .19	.08	.44	- .03	.25	- .05	- .22	.08
V	- .05	- .14	.08	.14	- .38	.12	- .18	.02	.09	.20
VI	.03	- .22	.22	- .09	- .65	- .06	- .21	- .12	.45	- .19
F Ratio[b]	3.1	8.6	5.5	6.6	78.6	2.8	20.2	1.8	15.2	7.0
F Prob	.01	.00	.00	.00	.00	.02	.00	.12	.00	.00

[a] Group means on each dimension are zero.

[b] Readers are cautioned that sampling procedures and weighting techniques make tests of significance problematic.

Table 4

Level of Importance of Variables by Family Life Cycle[a]

Most Important		Second in Importance		Third in Importance	
Life Cycle Stage I					
1. Housing costs	15.1	Healthiness of environment	10.7	Culture in area	8.7
2. Peace and quiet	10.3	Housing costs	9.2	Reputation of neighborhood	6.9
3. Opportunities for advancement	8.3	Convenience to medical facilities	8.6	Inside appearance	6.7
Life Cycle Stage II					
1. Housing costs	21.4	Housing costs	10.6	Housing costs	10.0
2. Convenience to work	8.5	Quality of local services	8.5	Healthiness of environment	6.9
3. Job security	7.5	Friendliness of neighbors	7.5	Standard of living	6.5
Life Cycle Stage III					
1. Housing costs	31.4	Quality of schools	12.9	Quality of schools	10.2
2. Quality of schools	7.3	Healthiness of environment	9.0	Convenience to work	10.0
3. Job security	6.7	Earnings or salary	8.9	Job security	8.4
Life Cycle Stage IV					
1. Housing costs	24.1	Quality of schools	12.0	Quality of schools	9.1
2. Quality of schools	9.7	Housing costs	11.9	Convenience to medical facilities	7.6
3. Job security	9.4	Job security	8.8	Job security	7.5
Life Cycle Stage V					
1. Housing costs	27.4	Convenience to medical facilities	11.9	Convenience to medical facilities	12.4
2. Convenience to medical facilities	12.4	Housing costs	8.4	Quality of local services	7.0
3. Peace and quiet	7.6	Quality of local services	6.3	Convenience to shopping	6.2
Life Cycle Stage VI					
1. Housing costs	24.3	Property taxes	8.0	Convenience to shopping	8.5
2. Convenience to medical facilities	11.1	Peace and quiet	7.2	Friendliness of neighbors	7.1
3. Public transportation	6.7	Convenience to church	6.9	Property taxes	6.8

[a]Please note these are NOT combinations of the three importance items.

Table 5

Probability of Moving if Having first Choice, First and Second Choice, and First, Second, and Third Choice by Life Cycle

Level of Choice	Family Life Cycle Stages							
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	F Ratio[a]	F Prob.
First Choice	2.89	2.21	2.78	2.20	1.86	1.86	8.7	.00
First and Second Choices	3.25	2.72	3.26	2.62	2.09	1.98	14.0	.00
First, Second, and Third Choices	3.56	3.02	3.37	2.96	2.27	2.05	14.2	.00

[a] Readers are cautioned that the sampling procedures and weighting techniques make tests of significance problematic.

APPENDIX

Mean Level of Importance for Residential Characteristics by Life Cycle Stage

Preference Items	Life Cycle Stages I	II	III	IV	V	VI	F Ratio[a]	F Prob.
Size of rooms	2.04	1.98	2.26	2.27	2.04	1.92	9.43	.00
Room arrangement	1.94	1.97	1.96	2.05	1.93	1.68	5.99	.00
Age of dwelling	1.75	1.73	1.89	1.69	1.62	1.63	2.65	.02
Housing costs	2.47	2.60	2.75	2.67	2.54	2.53	4.20	.00
Outside appearance	2.12	2.23	2.22	2.23	2.25	2.08	1.88	.09
Inside appearance	2.35	2.56	2.34	2.28	2.28	2.19	4.48	.00
Spaciousness of yard	2.12	2.21	2.38	2.31	2.01	1.74	18.26	.00
Number of rooms	2.02	1.93	2.16	2.24	1.95	1.77	15.37	.00
Peace and quiet	2.24	2.32	2.23	2.32	2.43	2.23	2.61	.02
Friendliness of neighbors	1.99	2.21	2.45	2.22	2.28	2.18	3.98	.00
Reputation of neighborhood	1.78	2.08	2.32	2.31	2.29	2.18	6.49	.00
Kind of people around	1.79	2.04	2.17	2.16	2.16	2.04	3.26	.01
General neighborhood appearance	2.07	2.28	2.26	2.21	2.27	2.05	3.96	.00
Quality of local services	2.53	2.50	2.63	2.53	2.57	2.47	1.23	.29
Availability of parks, etc.	2.09	2.09	2.18	1.97	1.66	1.54	19.08	.00
Healthiness of environment	2.50	2.63	2.63	2.54	2.48	2.32	5.44	.00
Safeness of streets	2.56	2.36	2.67	2.52	2.48	2.44	3.25	.01
Public transportation	2.03	1.92	1.93	1.74	2.07	2.14	8.72	.00
Local property taxes	2.27	2.32	2.43	2.50	2.50	2.33	3.24	.01
Local racial situation	1.90	1.91	1.61	1.83	1.89	1.63	3.81	.00
Adequate zoning	2.10	1.97	2.05	2.15	2.05	1.79	5.86	.00
Number of neighborhood children	1.48	1.39	1.73	1.47	1.45	1.32	4.96	.00
Quality of schools	2.43	2.15	2.77	2.66	1.98	1.93	50.73	.00
Availability of entertainment	1.85	1.55	1.65	1.54	1.53	1.43	3.24	.01
Opportunities for job advancement	2.42	2.56	2.48	2.26	2.01	2.35	7.39	.00
Job security	2.18	2.59	2.74	2.57	2.47	2.53	4.79	.00
Earnings or salary	2.53	2.51	2.67	2.53	2.50	2.43	1.43	.21
Job fringe benefits	2.26	2.58	2.66	2.59	2.58	2.51	2.29	.04
Overall work situation	2.45	2.50	2.56	2.44	2.32	2.34	2.45	.03
Climate	1.86	1.82	1.69	1.92	2.05	1.82	4.79	.00
Water, mountains, etc.	1.83	1.81	1.93	1.99	1.93	1.61	6.40	.00
Opportunities for culture	1.94	1.72	1.54	1.58	1.47	1.40	5.93	.00
Opportunities for lots of people	1.97	1.62	1.84	1.65	1.60	1.51	5.23	.00
Opportunities for groups, clubs, etc.	1.58	1.59	1.66	1.53	1.58	1.52	0.97	.43
Shopping facilities	2.19	2.15	2.28	2.18	2.24	2.24	0.74	.59
Community size	1.53	1.71	1.55	1.65	1.61	1.45	2.37	.04
Standard of living	1.93	2.17	2.22	2.16	2.04	1.99	3.74	.00
TV, radio, newspapers	2.06	2.20	2.25	2.13	2.20	2.29	1.95	.08
Convenience to work	2.13	2.27	2.31	2.17	2.14	1.87	3.41	.01
Convenience to shopping	2.14	2.21	2.26	2.15	2.26	2.35	2.22	.05
Convenience to friends	1.56	1,79	1.78	1.67	1.83	2.04	8.40	.00
Convenience to relatives	1.46	1.69	1.80	1.53	1.76	2.01	12.54	.00
Convenience to downtown	1.57	1.63	1.41	1.35	1.45	1.63	6.07	.00
Convenience to recreational facilities	1.73	1.84	1.95	1.95	1.47	1.34	29.88	.00
Convenience to medical facilities	2.34	2.42	2.68	2.61	2.55	2.46	4.13	.00
Convenience to church	1.75	2.03	2.25	2.30	2.27	2.26	6.51	.00
Convenience to schools	2.08	2.97	2.56	2.46	1.76	1.58	57.14	.00
N	35	68	97	337	290	130		

a Readers are cautioned that the sampling techniques and weighting procedures make tests of statistical significance problematic. Statistical tests, where used, should be viewed with caution.